Causative morphemes as a de-transitivizing device : What do non-canonical instances reveal about causation and causativization?

Kittilä, Seppo

2013

Kittilä , S 2013 , ' Causative morphemes as a de-transitivizing device : What do non-canonical instances reveal about causation and causativization? ' , Folia Linguistica , þÿvol. 47 , no. 1 , pp. 271 295 . https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2013.008

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/250876
https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2013.008

other
publishedVersion

Causative morphemes as a de-transitivizing device: what do non-canonical instances reveal about causation and causativization?[1]

Seppo Kittilä
University of Helsinki

Causativization is typically understood as a process that increases the valency of verbs via agent introduction. In addition, causatives have other functions, such as agentivization. Here, we examine even less orthodox functions of causative morphemes: cases in which causativization decreases the degree of transitivity associated with the denoted event – that is, the expressed function is the exact opposite of the canonical function. The expression of this function by causative morphemes becomes understandable if we consider the differences between agent-related and causer-related causation. In agent-related causation, the original clause involves no agent and agent introduction is thus complete (as in 'the child broke the vase'). In the causer-related causation, agent introduction is less complete since the original event already involves an agent ('I made him build a house'). The occurrence of transitivity-decreasing causatives is explained by referring to features of causer-related causation. Moreover, the article proposes a grammaticalization path for de-transitivizing causatives based on instances of causer-related causation.

Keywords: causativization, causatives, agency, de-transitivization

1. Introduction

Causativization is typically understood as a morphologically signalled process that adds an Agent to the valency of verbs (see e.g. Comrie 1975: 2). Examples of agent-adding causatives are shown in (1).

[1] I would like to thank the anonymous referees of *Folia Linguistica* for their comments on an earlier version of this paper. I also thank the Academy of Finland for providing funding for this study (grants 105771 and 1127724).

Folia Linguistica 47/1 (2013), 113–137. DOI 10.1515/FLIN.2013.006
ISSN 0165–4004, E-ISSN 1614–7308

(1) Turkish (Comrie 1975: 5–8)

Causativization of intransitive clauses (1 → 2)

a. *Ali* *öl-dü.*
PN.NOM die-PAST
'Ali died.'

b. *Ali* *hasan-ı öl-dür-dü.*
PN.NOM PN-ACC die-CAUS-PAST
'Ali killed Hasan.'

Causativization of transitive clauses (2 → 3)

c. *Müdür* *mektub-u imzala-dı.*
director.NOM letter-ACC sign-PAST
'The director signed the letter.'

d. *Dišçi* *mektub-u müdür-e* (*-*ü*) *imzala-t-tı.*
dentist letter-ACC director-DAT (*ACC) sign-CAUS-PAST
'The dentist made the director sign the letter.'

Causativization of ditransitive clauses (3 → 4)

e. *Müdür* *hasan-a mektub-u göster-di.*
director.NOM PN-DAT letter-ACC show-PAST
'The director showed the letter to Hasan.'

f. *Dišçi* *hasan-a mektub-u müdür tarafından*
director.NOM PN-DAT letter-ACC director by
göster-t-ti.
show-CAUS-PAST
'The dentist made the director show the letter to Hasan.'

Regardless of the number of participants in the underlying event, the most notable effect of causativization in (1) is the introduction of an agent (or external causer). Causativization thus increases verbal valency by one in all the cases above. The result is a transitive verb in (1b), a ditransitive verb in (1d) and a tritransitive verb with four overt arguments in (1f). As noted above, this feature is crucial to causativization: a linguistic element (such as an affix, particle, auxiliary etc.) cannot be regarded as a causativizing morpheme if it lacks this function completely.[2] Additionally, causative morphemes have other kinds of function across languages. A rather frequent (and also well understandable) extension from the agent-adding function is illustrated in (2) and (3).

[2] This is naturally a matter of definition, but this use of the term is well established in linguistics.

(2) Godoberi (Kibrik 1996: 128)
   a. *Mak'i–di łeni čibi.*
      child-ERG water splash.PAST
      'The child splashed the water (perhaps involuntarily).'
   b. *Mak'i-di łeni čib-ali.*
      child-ERG water splash-CAUS.PAST
      'The child splashed the water (purposefully and repeatedly).'

(3) Tsez (Comrie 2000: 365)
   a. *Uži-q č'ikay y-exu-s.*
      boy-POSS glass:ABS II-break-PAST.WIT
      'The boy accidentally broke the glass.'
   b. *Už-ā č'ikay y-exu-r-si.*
      boy-ERG glass:ABS II-break-CAUS-PAST.WIT
      'The boy broke the glass.'

In contrast to (1), the number of clausal constituents is maintained in (2) and (3) (in (3), argument marking is affected). Instead, causativization increases (or stresses) the high degree of agency (understood as a notion comprising features such as volitionality, control and intentionality) associated with the instigator; the instigation is more purposeful and intentional in (b), where a causative morpheme has been added to the verb. That causativization can also have a kind of agentivizing function – illustrated in (2) and (3) – is not especially surprising given that in both (1b) and (2) and (3b) causativization adds a canonical agent to the denoted event. The events in (1a), (2) and (3a) differ in that the event in (1a) lacks an agent altogether, while (2) and (3a) have a causer whose degree of agency is, however, rather low (for a more detailed discussion of similar cases, see Kittilä 2009).

Different aspects of causative constructions constitute a recurring topic of linguistics studies (for some recent studies, see Song 1996, Dixon 2000, Shibatani (ed.) 2001, Kittilä 2009). The present article also concerns functions of causative morphemes, but in contrast to the studies noted here, the focus lies on causatives that (unexpectedly) decrease the agency/semantic transitivity of the denoted event. An example is provided in (4):

(4) Finnish
   a. *Henkilö laula-a.*
      person.NOM sing-3SG.PRES
      'A person is singing.'

b. *Henkilö-ä laula-tt-aa.*
person-PART sing-CAUS-3SG.PRES
'A person feels like singing (for some internal, unspecified cause).'

Example (4a) involves a typical agent that volitionally instigates an act of singing. In (4b), the verb has been causativized, which also has formal consequences: S (the sole argument of the intransitive construction in question) appears in the partitive case. These formal changes are semantically motivated: (4b) does not involve a typical agent, but rather a participant who feels an urge to sing. The singing is conceptualized as less volitional. The only participant of the given event thus lacks one of the proto-agent features, as defined by Dowty (1991). Moreover, the participant in question does not have to be actually singing when (4b) is uttered. The event may lack instigation altogether, which further decreases the agency associated with the referent of the sole argument of (4b). In other words, (4b) is a semantically less transitive version of (4a) due to a decreased degree of agency. The main difference between (4a) and (4b) is the presence of the causative morpheme, which also causes changes in the coding of the sole argument of the construction.

The goal of the article is to increase our understanding of causativization by discussing cases that clearly deviate from the expected pattern. We concentrate therefore on cases such as (4). The semantic differences in the nature of agent introduction in (1) are relevant to the discussion in this article. In (1b), agent introduction is complete, since the underlying event in (1a) lacks an agent altogether (see Launey 2001 for a similar analysis of Classical Nahuatl causatives). The result of causativization is thus a typical transitive event coded by the canonical transitive construction of Turkish. In (1d) and (1f), on the other hand, the original event involves an agent, which renders agent introduction less complete; some, or even all, agent properties are already present in the underlying event. We are thus rather dealing with an introduction of an external causer primarily responsible for instigating the event in question, but which does not perform the action him/herself (see Section 3 for a more detailed discussion). The differences between these two types of causation (labeled as agent- and causer-related causation in this article, see Section 3 for details) aid us in explaining the seemingly bizarre grammaticalization path from agent introduction to detransitivization, as will be shown below. Moreover, they offer a new perspective to the more restricted causativization of transitive (as opposed to

intransitive) verbs, and the differences also explain the somewhat bizarre behavior of double causatives.

Before proceeding to the examination itself, it is crucial to define the scrutinized elements in detail. A morpheme is relevant to the present study if it fulfills two criteria:

1. the examined morpheme has an agent-adding function. In other words, the examined elements constitute typical causative morphemes;
2. the examined morphemes also have a transitivity-decreasing function in favourable conditions.

The discussed causative morphemes thus bear a dual role; they are typical causative morphemes which can also express de-transitivizing functions. A typical example of such an element is illustrated in (5) (in bold).

(5) Finnish
   a. *Lumi sul-i.*
      snow.NOM melt-3SG.PAST
      'The snow melted.'
   b. *Henkilö sula-**tt**-i lume-n.*
      person.NOM melt-CAUS-3SG.PAST snow-ACC
      'A person melted the snow.'
   c. *Minä naura-n.*
      1SG.NOM laugh.PRES-1SG
      'I laugh.'
   d. *Minu-a naura-**tt**-aa.*
      1SG-PART laugh-CAUS-3SG.PRES
      'I feel like laughing.'

In (5b), the affix *-tt-* functions as a causative morpheme, and it increases the valency of the causativized verb via agent introduction. In (5d), on the other hand, the addition of the same causative morpheme does not increase the valency of the verb: it only affects the case marking of the sole participant. This has a semantic reason: the agency associated with participant is lower in (5d) than in (5c). The affix *-tt-* thus meets both of the criteria set above. In the remainder of the article, only the de-transitivizing uses of the examined causative morphemes will be considered.

On the other hand, we do not take into account languages with two causative morphemes that express distinct functions. Consider:

(6) Kammu (Svantesson 1983: 106)
a. *Kee p-háan tráak.*
3SG.M $CAUS_1$-die buffalo
'He slaughtered the buffalo.' (deliberate causation)
b. *Kee tòk háan múuc.*
3SG.M $CAUS_2$ die ant
'He happened to kill an ant.' (e.g. by accidentally treading on it)

Causatives such as those in (6) are outside the scope of this article; in addition, in (6b) the causative element increases the transitivity of the underlying event, since it increases the valency by introducing an involuntary agent. Only causative morphemes with an evident de-transitivizing function (the transitivity of the affected clause decreases as a result of causativization) are taken into account. Examples like (6) would be relevant to this article only if the morpheme *p-* would be maintained, in addition to which another element responsible for the transitivity decrease would be added to (6a).

It is also in order to note that the presentation is based on a rather random sample of languages. We will therefore not say anything about the frequencies of the discussed types. This follows, since most grammars and other studies consulted for the study do not discuss de-transitivizing causatives in any way. This may be due to the absence of such causatives in the given language, or the author may not have looked for them. If the latter is the case, it is my hope that the article at hand will make this possible and that future studies of causatives in individual languages will take into account this aspect as well. The goal of the article is to discuss de-transitivizing causatives and their contribution to our understanding of causativization from a primarily theoretical perspective.

The organization of the article is as follows. Section 2 presents some data. The examined cases will be divided into two, based on whether they affect individual transitivity features (such as agency and affectedness) or whether they have consequences for verb valency. In Section 3 I discuss the differences between agent-related and causer-related causation in detail. It will be shown that instances of causer-related causation are more relevant to the emergence of de-transitivizing causatives. Section 4 discusses the theoretical consequences of our findings for our understanding of causatives and causation.

2. Presenting de-transitivizing causatives

2.1. Preliminaries

Two types of de-transitivizing causatives will be distinguished (we define de-transitivization as any decrease in the semantic transitivity of the denoted event, which is not necessarily manifested via changes in argument marking). First, de-transitivization may affect individual features of semantic transitivity, rendering the resulting construction lower in semantic transitivity (understood in the spirit of, for instance, Hopper & Thompson 1980 and Næss 2007). This type can be further subdivided according to the affected feature. The second type includes cases in which the valency of the resulting construction is affected, but in contrast to the canonical instances, causativization results in a valency decrease.

2.2. Transitivity-decreasing causatives

2.2.1. *De-agentivizing causatives*

As noted above, causativization typically concerns the agent: it either adds an agent to the denoted event (as in (1)), or it affects individual features of agency (as in (2) and (3), where the intentionality and control are affected). De-agentivizing causatives have this feature in common with typical causatives, but in contrast to typical instances, causativization decreases the degree of agency associated with the instigator. Consider:

(7) Finnish
   a. *Henkilö tappo-i kissa-n-sa/itse-n-sä.*
   person.NOM kill-3SG.PAST cat-ACC-3.POSS/self-ACC-3POSS
   'A person killed his/her cat (on purpose).'
   b. *Henkilö tapa-tt-i kissa-n-sa/itse-n-sä.*
   person.NOM kill-CAUS-3SG.PAST
   'A person had his/her cat/him/herself killed/killed the cat/him/herself accidentally.'
   c. *Henkilö laula-a.*
   person.NOM sing-3SG.PRES
   'A person is singing.'
   d. *Henkilö-ä laula-tt-aa*
   person-PART sing-CAUS-3SG.PRES
   'A person feels like singing (for some internal, unspecified cause).'

(8) Mangap-Mbula (Bugenhagen 1995: 175)
a. *Aŋ-kaaga kataama*
1SG-open door
'I opened the door.'
b. *Aŋ-pa-kaaga kataama*
1SG-CAUS-open door
'I managed to get the door open.'

The examples in (7a), (7c) and (8a) denote events instigated by canonical agents, as the free translations demonstrate. In (7b) and (7d), on the other hand, the degree of agency associated with the instigator is lower. The decrease in agency is somewhat differently motivated in the illustrated cases. In (7b) the causation is accidental. The agent is considered responsible for the denoted event, but in contrast to (7a) it is not the intention of the agent to cause the event to occur. Example (7c) has a canonical agent that volitionally participates in an event that it is also in control of. In (7d), in turn, someone feels the urge to sing, the reason for which is not specified (even though this would be possible). Moreover, in contrast to (7c), the agent does not need to be actually singing in (7d), that is, we are not necessarily dealing with an actual agent in this case. Example (8a) has a canonical agent that performs a typical transitive action, while in (8b) the agent needs to struggle to complete the denoted event successfully. The degree of control exercised by the agent is thus lower than in (8a), which renders the overall agency associated with the instigator lower (see also Dixon 2000: 72 for a similar remark on English).

In examples (7) and (8), the illustrated constructions can be distinguished based on the presence or absence of a single causative morpheme. These cases can be viewed as the paradigm cases of transitivity-decreasing causatives. In addition, there are cases in which double (or multiple) causativization may have a transitivity-decreasing function. Two examples are given in (9) and (10):

(9) Chrau (Dixon 2000: 70, cited from Thomas 1969: 100)
a. *Ănh ôp dăq khlâyh*
1SG CAUS_2 trap escape
'I made the trap spring (on purpose).'
b. *Ănh ôp dăq ta-khlâyh*
1SG CAUS_2 trap CAUS_1-escape
'I made the trap spring (accidentally).'

(10) Tuvan (Kulikov 1993: 53)
a. *Inek ün-dür-t-ken*
cow go.out-CAUS-CAUS-PAST
'The cow was led out.'
b. *Inek ün-dür-t-tür-ken*
cow go.out-CAUS-CAUS-CAUS-PAST
'The cow was led out (by force).'

Sentence (9a) illustrates a canonical instance of causativization, where an agent is introduced to the denoted event. Double causativization, as in (9b), for its part, decreases agency. In Tuvan, the difference is between double causativization and triple causativization. Double causativization is related to typical causativization, where the agent causes an event to happen. The result of triple causativization illustrated in (10b) is a decrease in control exercised by the agent; as in (10b), the agent needs to put more effort to making the event to happen, that is, the degree of control it has over the outcome of the event is lower than in (10a).

Examples examined in this section can be seen as the mirror image of the cases illustrated in (2) and (3). In all of these cases, the degree of agency associated with the instigator is affected. The central difference between (2)–(3) and (7)–(10) lies in the fact that in (7)–(10) the degree of agency decreases. The occurrence of this type of causative may seem unexpected at first, but can be explained by features of causer-related causation; we discuss this in Section 3.

2.2.2. *Causativization affecting other features than agency*

In Section 2.2.1 we discussed cases in which causativization decreases agency. Agency is, as has been illustrated in detail, for example, by DeLancey (1984) and Dowty (1991), an integral part of semantic transitivity, which means that the semantic transitivity of events coded by causativized clauses is lower than in the non-causative clauses in (7)–(10). Causativization may also affect other features of semantic transitivity, such as affectedness and telicity (see Kittilä 2009 for a more detailed discussion). Similarly, there are languages in which causativization decreases transitivity by affecting features of transitivity other than agency. Consider:

(11) Kambera (Klamer 1998: 180, 186)

a. *Tila-nanya na njara.*
kick-3SG.CONT ART horse
'The horse is kicking (now).'

b. *Rimang, na-pa-tila na njara.*
look.out 3SG.NOM-CAUS-kick ART horse
'Be careful, the horse kicks.' (i.e. it is her character)

c. *Da-pa-tila.*
3PL.NOM-CAUS-kick
'They kick (each other).'

(12) Tuvan (Kulikov 1993: 132)

a. *Ašak bajyr-ga inek-ti dile-t-ken.*
old.man Bajyr-DAT cow-ACC look for-CAUS-PAST
'An old man caused Bajyr to look for the cow (one time).'

b. *Ašak bajyr-ga inek-ti dile-t-tir-ken.*
old.man Bajyr-DAT cow-ACC look for-CAUS-CAUS-PAST
'An old man caused Bajyr to look for the cow (several times).'

c. *Ašak bajyr-ga inek-ti dile-t-tir-t-ken.*
old.man Bajyr-DAT cow-ACC look for-CAUS-CAUS-CAUS-PAST
'An old man caused Bajyr to look for the cow (many times).'

Example (11a) describes a concrete witnessed event in which a horse is kicking someone. There is thus an actual agent present. The example in (11b), in turn, describes a habit, something that is characteristic of the horse in question. In contrast to (11a), the horse does not need to be kicking when the clause is uttered, but we are dealing with a habitual event that may occur again in the future. What is relevant here is that there is no actual agent or patient present, that is, participants of a canonical transitive event are lacking (habitual events rank generally lower for transitivity; see Gerstner-Link 1998 and Kittilä 2002: 226–227). Sentence (11c), too, denotes a reciprocal event whose overall transitivity is lower, since the agent is also an affected participant (see e.g. Kemmer 1993 for more detailed discussion). In (12), the affected feature of transitivity is punctuality. As argued, for example, by Hopper & Thompson (1980: 252), punctual events rank higher for transitivity than non-punctual events, which means that multiple causativization decreases the overall transitivity of events in (12b) and (12c).

2.3. Valency-decreasing causatives

In addition to the instances of causativization discussed in Section 2.2 – in which the number of arguments is maintained and de-transitivization concerns only individual features of semantic transitivity – there are languages in which causativization may decrease the valency of the affected verb. Typical examples are those in (13) and (14):

(13) Korean (examples courtesy of Soon Mi Hong-Schunka)
a. *Ku saram-i na-rul po-ass-ta.*
DET person-NOM 1SG-ACC see/look-PAST-DECL
'The man saw me'
b. *Ku saram-i na-eykey kurim-ul po-i-ess-ta.* (causative)
DET man-NOM 1SG-DAT picture-ACC see/look-CAUS-PAST-DECL
'The man showed me the picture.'
c. *Ku saram-i po-i-ess-ta.* (passive)
DET man-NOM see/look-PASS-PAST-DECL
'The man was seen.'

(14) West Greenlandic (Fortescue 1984: 265)
a. *Nanuq-∅ taku-tip-puq.* (causative)
polar.bear-ABS see-CAUS-3SG.IND
'The polar bear let itself be seen.'
b. *Qimmi-mut kii-sip-puq.* (passive)
dog-ALL bite-CAUS-3SG.IND
'He was bitten by a dog.'

In Korean and West Greenlandic, the same affix may both introduce an agent, as in (13b) and (14a) and delete/background it, as in (13c) and (14b). At first, this kind of polysemy may appear unexpected, since causative morphemes express a function that can be considered the exact opposite of their typical functions. However, as shown by Haspelmath (1990: 46–49), the grammaticalization path from causative to passive is not at all uncommon. The examples from West Greenlandic are rather illustrative in this regard. In (14a), the referent of the subject allows itself to be targeted by the event in question. The contribution of the (implicit) agent to the success of the event is less significant than in typical cases, where the agent is primarily responsible for instigation. In (14b) the agent is formally present, but its marking deviates from the expected ergative marking; the agent is formally an oblique.

3. On the emergence of de-transitivizing causatives

3.1. Preliminaries

In this section, the rationale behind the occurrence of de-transitivizing causatives is discussed. It will be shown that the development of causative morphemes into de-transitivizing devices constitutes a rather natural, yet not so frequently attested grammaticalization path if we consider the differences between two types of causativization divided on the basis of the nature of the underlying event. We label the two types of causation agent-related and causer-related causation. In the first case, a canonical agent is introduced (see (1b) for an example), while in the second type we are rather dealing with an external causer that is not directly involved in performing the denoted action him/herself (see (1d)). The types are reminiscent of direct and indirect causation – Shibatani and Pardeshi's (2001: 89–91) labels – and they also resemble the well-known distinction between causativization of unaccusative and transitive verbs. I have, however, opted for different labels for these instances of causation, since one of the central differences between the types lies in the nature of the causing entity introduced via causativization. In this section we focus on causer-related causation since this type is more relevant to the emergence of de-transitivizing causatives.

3.2. Agent-related and causer-related causation

As has been shown in the examples above, causativization is not a homogeneous process, but causative morphemes serve different functions in different languages. Moreover, the examples in (1) can be further distinguished based on the nature of agent introduction, even though the basic function is the same in these cases. In (1b), agent introduction can be regarded as complete, since the underlying event ('Ali died') lacks all agentive features (the only participant is a patient), while the resulting event is instigated by a canonical agent. Agent introduction is complete in the sense that we proceed from zero to full agency (all features of agency are introduced via causation). The agent slot is unoccupied and the event may easily accommodate an agent (see also Launey 2001 and Shibatani 2001: 7). In (1d) and (1f), on the other hand, we are not dealing with a complete agent introduction, because the underlying events ('the director signed the letter' and 'the director showed the letter to Hasan') already involve an agent and the agent slot is thus occupied. Instead, causativization adds an external

causer ('additional agent') to the denoted event, whence the chosen labels. Moreover, differently from the agent-related causation, features of agency are not introduced. This distinction is very close to what Shibatani and Pardeshi have labelled as direct and indirect causation:

> Therefore it is a good first approximation to define **direct causation** as a situation involving an agentive causer and a patientive causee and **indirect causation** as one involving two agentive participants, one an agentive causer and the other an agentive causee. (Shibatani and Pardeshi 2001: 89; emphasis mine)

Schematically, the differences between agent-related and causer-related causation may be illustrated as follows[3] (agents/instigators relevant to the discussion are bold):

Agent-related causation
Underlying event
'The vase broke.'

The vase [−VOL] [−INST] [+AFF]

Caused event
'**The child** broke the vase (on purpose).'

The child **[+VOL] [+INST] [−AFF]**
The vase [−VOL] [−INST] [+AFF]

Causer-related causation
Underlying event
'**The bricklayer** built the house.'

The bricklayer **[+VOL] [+INST] [−AFF]**
The house [−VOL] [−INST] [+AFF]

Caused event
'**The teacher** made **the bricklayer** build the house.'
The teacher [+VOL] [+INST] [−AFF]
The bricklayer [−VOL] [−INST] [+AFF]
The house [−VOL] [−INST] [+AFF]

[3] The notation and the employed labels are taken from Næss (2007). VOL refers to volitionality (which participant is acting volitionally), INST to instigation (which participant is primarily responsible for instigating the event in question) and AFF to affectedness (which participant is most directly affected by the event).

As shown above, (patientive/unaccusative) intransitive events have only one participant that undergoes a salient change of state. This happens spontaneously without any intervention from an external agent. The only participant involved lacks all agentive features in being non-volitional and non-instigating. The result of agent-related causation is thus a typical transitive event with a canonical agent and a thoroughly affected patient (see Næss 2007: 27–49 for a detailed analysis of the transitive prototype). The introduced agent is a prototypical agent that instigates the event, is acting volitionally, but is in no direct way affected by the event it initiates.

In the case of causer-related causation, the nature of causation is drastically different. This follows, since the underlying event involves an agent and complete agent introduction is therefore no longer possible. The agent slot is already occupied and the introduced participant is only a kind of additional agent who is involved in causing an event to happen together with the original agent (as noted by Shibatani 2001: 7, this type of causation depends also on the causee). Consequently, the result of causation is a division of agentive features, but the degree of 'overall agency' is maintained. Because the original agent – the causee in the caused event – is made to act by an external causer, causation deprives it of certain agentive features and makes it more patient-like (see also Siiroinen 2002: 210 for a similar observation).[4] The participant in question is somehow affected by the event it partakes in, which is also manifested in case marking; the causee appears in the partitive instead of the nominative.

Similar changes are found in many other languages, as it is typical of causees to bear accusative (or similar) marking. Consequently, the causee is no longer the only instigating participant and it can be said to act less volitionally than in the non-caused event; it is made to perform an action it may not have instigated otherwise and it is not the first part of the causal chain that ultimately results in the event denoted. The added external causer, in turn, is not a typical agent in that it does not perform the denoted action him/herself, but only instigates the event in question. The causation may be verbal or physical and it may be more or less forceful, and the causer does not target its action at the patient, but on the causee. The external causer may, however, be said to be fully agentive in the sense that

[4] Here, the features are seen as dichotomies, which does not necessarily do justice to the nature of the event in all the cases. As regards the causer-related causation, the participant that can be seen as more volitional gets a plus for volitionality, and the participant that is primarily responsible for instigation is marked with '+' for INST.

it is volitionally causing an event to occur. As the illustration above shows, features of patient are not relevant to causation: the patient retains its features irrespective of the denoted event.

The differences between the two instances of causation are very relevant to the discussion in this article. The result of agent-related causation is a complete transitivization of the underlying event, which makes it rather unlikely that the de-transitivizing functions of causation illustrated earlier would have emerged on the basis of agent-related causatives. On the other hand, instances of causer-related causation are more applicable to explaining the occurrence of de-transitivizing causatives. The result of causer-related causation is an agent with some patient-like characteristics and a lower degree of agency due to the introduction of an external causer. The following examples from Finnish illustrate this development well:

(15) Finnish

a. *Henkilö laula-a.*
person.NOM sing-3SG.PRES
'A person is singing.'

Person [+VOL][+INST] [−AFF]

b. *Yksilö laula-tt-aa henkilö-ä.*
individual.NOM sing-CAUS-3SG.PRES person-PART
'An individual makes a person (causee) sing.'

Individual [+VOL][+INST][−AFF]
Person [−VOL][−INST] [+AFF]

c. *Henkilö-ä laula-tt-aa.*
person-PART sing-CAUS-3SG.PRES
'A person feels like singing (for some unexpressed reason).'

Person [−VOL][−INST] [+AFF]

Example (15a) denotes a typical intransitive event whose only participant is best considered agent. Sentence (15b) is a causativized version of (15a). The result is, as expected, a division of agentive features, since the underlying event also involves an agent. In (15c), the causer that is made explicit in (15b) has been omitted. We are left with an agent that ranks lower for agency than a typical agent, which becomes evident if we compare the agent of (15a) to the agent of (15c). It is also important to note that a less agentive reading emerges only if the causer is omitted. If we omit the causee from (15b) the reading would be 'an individual makes (someone unspecified) sing'. This is natural, since the introduced causer is a very agentive participant and its omission would not produce a less agentive reading. We

may add that in Finnish (15b) could also mean that thinking of an individual makes the person in question sing ('thinking of an individual makes a person feel like singing'). This kind of reading is not possible with agent-related causation, which further underlines the differences between agent-related and causer-related causation.

The grammaticalization that has resulted in the emergence of the so-called causative emotive verbs in Finnish is largely unclear (it cannot be verified by actual sources), but a few hypotheses can be and have been made (the discussion here is largely based on Siiroinen 2002). First, Finnish is known for its partitive subjects (see e.g. Helasvuo & Huumo 2010 for a recent discussion), which means that the occurrence of constructions such as those in (15) is not surprising. Second, Finnish has a rather free word order, which enabled the partitively marked object to move to subject position (as in (15c)) if it serves as a discourse-topic. This is especially natural in cases where the causer is inanimate and the cause is animate (as in 'I am afraid of the storm'), since subjects tend to be animate (see e.g. Keenan 1976 and Comrie 1989: 189) and subjects tend to be clause-initial. When the animate entity occupies the subject slot, the causer is put into the background and it can be omitted altogether. The subject, however, retains its semantically more patient-like nature, which has given rise to the emergence of the causative emotion verbs in Finnish. It is not clear when this kind of development has occurred. According to Siiroinen (2002), the construction is productive in older dialects already, but it is not attested in older literal sources. This kind of grammaticalization path is applicable to Finnish data, but it remains unclear how a similar development has happened in other languages.

The examples and the discussion above suggest that the de-transitivizing functions of causatives are best explained by instances of causer-related causation. This is natural, because the result is a less typical agent if the causer is omitted. Further evidence for the differences between the two causativization types and for the occurrence of de-transitivizing causatives is provided in (16):

(16) Finnish
  a. Patient (non-deliberate change of state)
  Henkilö *laihtu-i.*
  person.NOM lose.weight-3SG.PAST
  'A person lost (some) weight.'
  Person [−INST][−VOL][+AFF]

b. Agent (deliberate change of state)
Henkilö laihdu-tt-i.
person.NOM lose.weight-CAUS-3SG.PAST
'A person (purposefully) lost some weight.'
Person [+INST][+VOL][+AFF]

c. Less agentive agent (irrealis event)
Henkilö-ä laihdu-tu-tt-i.
person-PART lose.weight-CAUS-CAUS-3SG.PAST
'A person felt like losing some weight.'
Person [−INST][−VOL][+AFF]

Both (16a) and (16b) denote events of losing weight. The difference between the examples lies in agency. In (16a), weight loss is conceptualized as a spontaneously occurring process that causes someone to lose weight without any special effort. In (16b), where the verb has been causativized, the same process is seen as following from a deliberate action by the agent. Someone has lost weight, for example, as a result of a strict diet combined with regular exercise. The differences between (16a) and (16b) thus illustrate a very typical example of agentivizing causativization, as the schematic illustrations also show (see also (2) and (3)). The agentivizing function is expected, because (16a) lacks an agent, which can easily be accommodated (even though no external agent is introduced in (16b)). However, complete agent introduction may be applied only once, as (16c) shows. The causativization has fully agentivized the originally unagentive participant in (16b), which has the consequence that agentivization is no longer possible. The sole participant of (16b) is a typical agent similar to agents of events such as 'the boy runs' and 'the brick layer built the house'. The result of causativization of (16b) is therefore an event with a less typical agent, very much in the same sense as in (15c). In other words, agentivization is possible as long as the caused event lacks an agent. After agent-introduction, only division of agent properties or a decrease in agency is possible.

4. Theoretical implications

It was shown in the previous section that in light of Finnish data the emergence of the de-transitivizing causatives discussed in Section 2 is best explained by features of causer-related causation. In these cases, the under-

lying event involves an agent, and the result of causativization is thus a division of agentive properties, not an increase in agency. In this section, I discuss the theoretical implications this has for our understanding of causatives and causativization.

First, the discussion and the data in this article underline the heterogeneous nature of causativization. The defining, most central feature of causativization is unarguably agent introduction, but in cases where this function cannot be served, causative morphemes develop other functions. Some of these functions can be explained by whether the caused event involves an agent, as was shown in Section 3. Agent introduction is the central function of causativization as far as this is made possible by the semantics of the denoted event, but the function changes, if typical agent introduction is excluded. The primacy of agent introduction may also be approached from a (speculative) diachronic perspective. Based on the distribution of causativization types, it seems plausible to claim that agent-related causation is always primary and grammaticalizes first. Causer-related causation is possible only if a language also has agent-related causatives, which is manifested, for example, in the cross-linguistically less restricted causativization of unaccusative verbs.There are also languages in which only unaccusative verbs may be causativized productively (see Rice 2000: 212 and Næss 2007: 63–64). Transitivity-decreasing causatives constitute even a later development, which is not attested at all in many languages (more detailed studies of causatives in less studied languages may, and hopefully will, cause changes in this view). Transitivity-decreasing functions of causatives also seem to be less productive in nature than canonical causatives; the number of contexts where a causative morpheme may have a de-transitivizing function is lower than the number of contexts where the same morpheme may express a causativizing function. For example, in examples such as (15) and (16), both causativizing and de-transitivizing functions are possible (it is possible to specify the agent/causer), while de-transitivizing functions are not possible with underived unaccusatives.

The primacy of agent-related causation also means that it is somehow expressed in all languages (languages vary drastically according to which variant, the intransitive or transitive, is marked in these cases, see Haspelmath 1993 and Nichols et al 2004 for more discussion). This is expected, since events such as 'break', 'melt' and 'open' may occur spontaneously or they may be externally caused. On the other hand, languages differ according to how they treat causer-related causation. A tripartite typology

may be proposed. First, there are languages that allow also agentive verbs (both intransitive and transitive) to be causativized in the same way as unaccusative verbs. The semantic consequences of causativization are naturally different, but the differences are not formally manifest. Languages of this type may be said to follow the principle of economy, since the attested differences can be retrieved from verbal semantics and formal differences are thus superfluous. Second, languages may allow causer-related causation, but the strategy employed is different from the one used for agent-related causation. For example, a language may causativize unaccusative verbs morphologically, while they employ periphrastic means for causativizing agentive verbs (examples include Marathi, Finnish, Ambae, Maori and K'iche'). These languages reflect the differences between the two types of causativization more directly than the languages of the first type, since the differences also have a formal manifestation. Finally, we have languages that block the causativization of agentive verbs completely or allow it in only a very limited set of contexts (examples include Yidiŋ, Kayardild, Maricopa, Urubu-Kaapor and Uradhi, see e.g. Dixon 2000: 46–47; 63–66 and Næss 2007: 63–64; see also Amberber 2002: 32 for Amharic). These languages seem to take the semantics of causativization very seriously, because causativization is blocked altogether in case complete agentivization is not possible. They provide us with perhaps the best evidence for the existence of agent- and causer-related causation and the primacy of agent introduction.

The discussion above also provides a semantic explanation for the more restricted causativization of transitive verbs attested in many languages (see e.g. Song 1996: 174ff for more detailed discussion). As has been observed by many scholars (see e.g. Song 1996: 174–178, Rice 2000: 212), unaccusative verbs are typically among those verbs that allow morphological causativization in case any verb in a language does, while many languages place restrictions on the causativization of other verbs. Several explanations have been offered for this. First, Bernard Comrie (1975) argues that the causee occupies the first open slot in the hierarchy subject > direct object > indirect object > other obliques. Thus in case the indirect object is already occupied (the indirect objects appears in the dative, for instance), demotion of the initial subject to this status is no longer possible, which in some languages has the consequence that causativization is blocked. Another kind of explanation, based on the formal nature of ditransitives in a language, was proposed by Song (1996: 174–175). Song suggests that causativization

of transitive verbs is possible in case a language has a ditransitive construction available for accommodating two direct object-like arguments. This explanation is probably valid for many languages (it accounts nicely for the data examined by Song), but it does not explain the differences between unaccusative and unergative verbs in any satisfactory manner. This division is best accounted for by the lack vs. presence of an agent in the denoted event. Unergative verbs already have an agent, which has consequences for the causativization of these verbs (they are thus semantically close to transitive verbs). Typically, causativization is formally different in these cases. For example, in languages such as Marathi (see Shibatani & Pardeshi 2001), Slave (see Rice 2000: 209) and also Finnish unaccusative verbs are causativized morphologically, while unergative verbs employ periphrastic means, or the case marking of the causee varies; the causee bears accusative marking with unaccusative verbs, while it occurs in the partitive with unergative verbs.

In case Comrie's hierarchy would account for all instances of causativization (and this is not to say that Comrie's claim would be this absolute either), we would not expect such a variation to occur. On the other hand, the explanation proposed here can explain also these kinds of difference. It is also worth noting that in Finnish the variation is between accusative (unaccusative verbs) and partitive (unergative verbs) marking, which in general marks differences between highly and less affected patients. In case causativization is complete, accusative coding occurs. A similar explanation is also proposed by Shibatani (2001: 7), who states that causativization of agentive verbs is more difficult due to a higher degree of difficulty in bringing about a causative situation.

The data in Section 2 illustrate another way of dealing with less typical instances of causativization. Some languages have gone even further and developed de-transitivizing elements from causer-related causatives. The emergence of these causatives is also best explained by the semantic differences between agent-related and causer-related causation. In this context, it is perhaps in order to refer to a study by Næss (2007) on the verb 'eat' across languages. Næss shows very convincingly that causativization of 'eat' differs from the causativization of other transitive verbs in a number of languages. The explanation proposed by Næss is based on the affected nature of the agent (the agent of 'eat' is also affected by the event it partakes in). What is relevant to the purposes of the present article is that 'eat' is in some languages (e.g. Amharic, Maricopa, Kolami and Sinhala; see Næss

2007: 63f) causativized in the same way as intransitive verbs. One of the reasons for this may be found in the fact that 'eat' involves an affected agent (that can be seen as a kind of patient as well), which makes its causativization less restricted and more similar to the causativization of unaccusative verbs.

The findings of this article also aid us in understanding the somewhat bizarre behavior of double causatives better. As has been shown by Kulikov (1993), double causatives (the label used by Kulikov is 'second causative') typically have functions different from those expressed by single causatives. For example, double causatives may stress the greater effort needed to cause an event to happen or they may even have de-transitivizing functions. In light of the discussion in Section 3, this is only expected. The first causative agentivizes the event, which has the consequence that additional causative morphemes cannot have an agent-introducing function anymore. The result may, for example, be more forceful causation or a decrease in agency. There are also many languages in which verbs allow only a single causativization, that is, one in which causativization is not recursive, which can also be explained by the differences between agent-related and causer-related causation.

Last, the discussion in this article aids us in understanding the expression of causatives and passives by the same mechanism attested in languages such as Korean and Japanese. At first sight, this polysemy appears unexpected. In the typical cases, causatives and passives serve functions that constitute the exact opposites of each other; passivization removes the agent from the clause core, while causativization introduces an additional agent to the denoted event. However, the two valency-changing operations are semantically more similar than their formal differences imply. Both of these mechanisms have consequences for the agent referent of the original clause. In passivization, the identity of the agent is affected, and the agent is typically indefinite or its identity is completely blurred. In causer-related causation, in turn, the original agent ranks lower for agency, which also decreases its agency. In other words, in both cases the agent referent of the derived clause is less-of-an-agent. The semantic closeness of causatives and passives is rather evident in cases such as 'The man had himself killed'. In this case, the man contributes to his own dying more actively than in 'A maniac killed the man'. What is also important is that the dying is externally caused, i.e. the man was killed by an (implied) external agent. In both 'the man had himself killed' and 'the man was killed', the subject refers to

an affected participant. This kind of semantic similarity between passives and causatives is present only with causer-related causation.

5. Summary

We have examined cases where causative morphemes express de-transitivizing functions as opposed to their typical functions associated with agent introduction. Even though the occurrence of this kind of polysemy seems unexpected at first, it can be explained by features of causer-related causation discussed in Section 3.

We underline the differences between two types of causation, discussed, for example by Shibatani and Pardeshi (2001). In the first type, agent introduction is complete. This type is illustrated by causation of unaccusative verbs, where the agent slot is fully unoccupied, which makes agent introduction natural for these cases. In the second type, the agent slot is already occupied, which means that complete agent introduction is no longer possible. The most important consequence of this is that the original agent is deprived of certain agentive properties, most notable volitionality and instigation, which renders it more patient-like and thus less of an agent. The less canonical nature of the agent is manifested in a variety of ways in languages. One of the typical ways of manifesting this is the less frequent (morphological) causativization of agentive verbs attested across languages all over the globe. As has been shown in this article, some languages go even further and causative morphemes have developed into de-transitivizing morphemes. The data we illustrated thus provide us with further evidence for the heterogeneous nature of causative morphemes.

As was noted in the introduction, this is not a typological article in the strictest sense of the word in that the data are not based on a carefully selected sample. This was not possible since de-transitivizing instances of causativization are discussed only in very few of the reference grammars consulted for this study. There is thus a lot left for future research. It is therefore my sincere hope that future studies of causatives will also consider potential de-transitivizing functions of causative morphemes. It is still unclear whether the languages presented in this study are in the minority cross-linguistically (which would explain the lack of these constructions in reference grammars), but it is also possible that, for example, field linguists have not been looking for them. In addition, it would be

interesting to know which of the examined de-transitivizing functions is more frequent across languages. The data discussed in this article do not allow any generalizations.

Abbreviations

ABS	Absolutive case
ACC	Accusative case
ALL	Allative case
ART	Article
CAUS	Causative
CONT	Continuative
DAT	Dative case
DECL	Declarative
DET	Determiner
ERG	Ergative case
IND	Indicative
M	Masculine
NOM	Nominative case
PART	Partitive case
PAST	Past tense
PAST.WIT	Witnessed past
PL	Plural
PN	Personal name
POSS	Possessive case
PRES	Present tense
SG	Singular

References

Amberber, Mengistu. 2002. *Verb classes and transitivity in Amharic*. Munich/Newcastle: Lincom.

Bugenhagen, Robert D. 1995. *A grammar of Mangap-Mbula: An Austronesian language of Papua New Guinea*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Comrie, Bernard. 1975. Causatives and Universal Grammar. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1974: 1–32.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Linguistic typology and language universals*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 2000. Valency-changing derivations in Tsez. In Dixon & Aikhenvald, eds. 360–374.

Comrie, Bernard & Maria Polinsky, eds. 1993. *Causatives and transitivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

DeLancey, Scott. 1984. Notes on agentivity and causation. *Studies in Language* 8: 181–213.

Dixon, R. M. W. 2000. A typology of causatives: Form, syntax and meaning. In Dixon & Aikhenvald, eds. 30–83.

Dixon, R. M. W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, eds. 2000. *Changing valency: Case studies in transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dowty, David. 1991. Thematic protoroles and argument selection. *Language* 67: 547–619.
Fortescue, Michael. 1984. *West Greenlandic*. London: Routledge.
Gerstner-Link, Claudia. 1998. How transitive are habituals? *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 51: 327–534.
Haspelmath, Martin. 1990. The grammaticalization of passive morphology. *Studies in Language* 14: 25–71.
Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations. In Comrie & Polinsky, eds. 87–120.
Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa & Huumo, Tuomas. 2010. Mikä subjekti on? [What is a subject?]. *Virittäjä* 114: 165–195.
Hopper, Paul J. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56: 251–299.
Keenan, Edward T. 1976. Towards a universal definition of "subject". In Charles N. Li, ed. *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press, 303–333.
Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *Middle voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Kibrik, Andrej A. 1996. Transitivity in lexicon and grammar. In Alexandr E. Kibrik, ed. *Godoberi*. Munich & Newcastle: Lincom Europa, 107–146.
Kittilä, Seppo. 2002. *Transitivity: Towards a comprehensive typology*. Turku: Åbo Akademis Tryckeri.
Kittilä, Seppo. 2009. Causative morphemes as non-valency increasing devices. *Folia Linguistica* 43: 67–94.
Klamer, Miriam. 1998. *Kambera*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Kulikov, Leonid I. 1993. The "second causative": A typological sketch. In Comrie & Polinsky, eds. 121–154.
Launey, Michel. 2001. On some causative doublets in Classical Nahuatl. In Shibatani, ed. 301–317.
Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical transitivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Nichols, Johanna, David A. Peterson and Jonathan Barnes. 2004. Transitivizing and detransitivizing languages. *Linguistic Typology* 8: 149–211.
Rice, Keren 2000. Voice and valency in the Athapaskan family. In Dixon & Aikhenvald, eds. 173–235.
Shibatani, Masayoshi, ed. 2001. *The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2001. Introduction. In Shibatani, ed. 1–22.
Shibatani, Masayoshi & Prashant Pardeshi. 2001. The causative continuum. In Shibatani, ed. 85–126.
Siiroinen, Mari. 2002. "Jopas kortittaa!" Nykysuomen tunnekausatiivilauseen alkuperää jäljittämässä [I feel like 'carding'! Searching for the origins of the Finnish causative emotion clauses]. In Ilona Herlin, Jyrki Kalliokoski, Lari Kotilainen & Tiina Onikki-Rantajääskö, eds. *Äidinkielen merkitykset* [The mean-

ings of the mother tongue]. Helsinki: SKS, 210–227.
Song, Jae Jung. 1996. *Causatives and causation*. London & New York: Longman.
Svantesson, Jan-Olof. 1983. *Kammu phonology and morphology*. Traveaux de l'institut de linguistique de Lund 18. Lund: University of Lund.
Thomas, D. M. 1969. Chrau affixes. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 3: 90–107.

Author's address:
Seppo Kittilä
University of Helsinki
General Linguistics
P. O. Box 24
00014 Helsinki
Finland
kittila@mappi.helsinki.fi

Received 21 September 2010
Revision invited: 14 January 2011
Accepted: 2 September 2011